## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

MARGUERITE HOFFMAN,

Plaintiff,

Civil Action No. 3:10-CV-0953-D

VS.

\$
L&M ARTS, et al.,

Defendants.

\$
Defendants.

## **ORDER**

Plaintiff has attached two exhibits to her August 3, 2012 brief in opposition to defendants' motions for summary judgment. This court's local rules do not permit exhibits to summary judgment briefs. These materials should either be part of a properly paginated and cited appendix, if they fall within the scope of N.D. Tex. Civ. R. 56.6(a), or, if they are intended as a form of argument, contained in plaintiff's brief and count toward the page limit.\*

Accordingly, if plaintiff decides to include the materials in Exhibits A and B in a revised brief, she must file the brief within 14 days of the date of this order. If she decides to include the materials in Exhibits A and B in a supplemental appendix, she must file within 14 days of the date of this order the supplemental appendix and a revised brief that properly cites the supplemental appendix. If she opts to stand on her present briefing (in which case the court will disregard Exhibits A and B and any briefing that cites the exhibits), she must advise the court in writing within

<sup>\*</sup>If plaintiff opts to rely on these materials in essentially their present form, she should consider this court's prior statements on the use of extensive listings in summary judgment briefing. *See, e.g., Bowe v. Exide Corp.*, 2001 WL 705881, at \*2 (N.D. Tex. June 18, 2001) (Fitzwater, J.).

14 days of the date of this order.

SO ORDERED.

August 7, 2012.

SIDNEY A. FITZW.

CHIEF JUDGE